

## **REMARKS**

Claims 7-11 are allowed. Claims 2, 3 and 5 are "objected to" and claims 1, 6 and 12-16 are rejected. Claim 1, 12, 14 and 15 have been amended. New claim 16 has been added and is somewhat similar to claim 15. Claims 1-16 are now pending and under consideration.

### **I. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 14:**

Claim 14 has been amended to overcome the objection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

### **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 6 AND 12-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MASAMICHI (JP04098387):**

The present invention as recited, for example, in claim 12, recites a method comprising "applying a spring force to an ink pack inside a cash box to cause the ink pack to move, thereby causing the ink pack to contact a knife portion in the cash box so that ink is released from the ink pack into the cash box." The Applicants respectfully submit that Masamichi fails to disclose this feature.

Instead, Masamichi discloses a cash box whereby a spring applies a force to an oscillation rod to move the rod toward an ink pack to tear the ink pack. The ink pack disclosed in Masamichi is stationary and therefore does not move. The ink then spills out of the ink pack by its own weight after the ink pack is torn (see FIG. 1 and the Abstract). Therefore, the present invention patentably distinguishes over Masamichi.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 12, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

### **III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MASAMACHI:**

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Masamichi fails to disclose the spring as a conical compression coil.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 also patentably distinguishes over Masamichi at least due to its dependency on claim 1 for the reasons mentioned above.

**IV. CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Feb 24, 2005

By:   
Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501